DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 780 CE 026 130

AUTHOR Wheeler, Linda
TITLE Phoenix Union High School District #210. CETA Youth Employment Training Program, 1979/80.
SPONS AGENCY Phoenix Union High School District, Ariz.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 55p.: Small type in tables will not reproduce well.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Employer Attitudes: Federal Programs: Followup Studies: Graduate Surveys: High Schools: Parent Attitudes: *Participant Satisfaction: Program Attitudes: *Program Effectiveness: Program Evaluation: School Districts: Secondary Education: Student Attitudes: Teacher Attitudes: *Vocational Education: *Youth Employment: *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *CETA Youth Employment Program: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: *Phoenix Union High School AZ

ABSTRACT

The 1979/80 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Youth Employment Training Program in the Phoenix Union High School District was evaluated in two ways: (1) enrollment figures and participant demographics were compared to project goals: and (2) opinion surveys of participants, job-site supervisors, youth advisors, and parents of participants were conducted. Findings indicated that enrollment goals for age, sex, and ethnic distribution were met. All groups surveyed indicated that the CETA program helped participants to develop good work habits and learn new skills. Relations between participants and their supervisors were seen as productive by all concerned. Youth advisors felt that they placed their clients as closely as possible to their career interests, and participants, parents and job supervisors concurred. Students liked their jobs and expressed favorable opinions of both their job supervisors and their youth advisors. Overall, the majority of participants, job-site supervisors, and parents rated the program as excellent. The majority of youth advisors rated it as good. (Comments from each of the survey groups are appended.) (LRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190780

PHOENIX UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT # 210

CETA Youth Employment Training Program

1979/80

REPORT NO. 33:07:80/81:002

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Shirley M. Peebles

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RESEARCH SERVICES

Carol Norris, Ph.D
Director

Linda Wheeler, M.A.
Program Evaluation Specialist

CE 026 130

AUG 2 5 1980

ABSTRACT

This report presents an evaluation of the 1979/80 CETA Youth Employment Training Program in the Phoenix Union High School District.

Program success was evaluated in two ways. First, enrollment figures and participant demographics were compared to project goals, as given in the original Title IIB and Title IV proposals. Second, opinion surveys of participants, job site supervisors, youth advisors, and parents of participants were conducted.

Enrollment goals for age, sex, and ethnic distribution of participants were well met. The expected percentages of handicapped individuals and juvenile offenders were also served.

Participants, job site supervisors, and parents were very satisfied with the CETA program. Youth advisors were positive about most aspects of the program, but felt that the amount of paperwork required was excessive. All groups concerned believed that participants learned good work habits and valuable job skills.

Participants reported increased self-confidence. They saw their CETA jobs as related to their interests, and felt that both youth advisors and job supervisors were helpful to them. Job supervisors enjoyed supervising the CETA students, and indicated that they would do so again if asked. Relations between participants and their supervisors were seen as productive by the majority of respondents in all groups surveyed.

While the program was very successful, no program is ever perfect. Therefore, several recommendations to ensure continued success are made. These recommendations are given at the end of the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PROGRAM GOALS AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS	1
Performance Standards	1
Enrollment Goals	4
SURVEY RESULTS	4
Student Survey	4
a. Attitudes Towards the Program	7
b. Attitudes Towards Job Site Supervisors	7
c. Attitudes Towards CETA Youth Advisors	7
d. Participant Work Habits	10
e. Transportation	10
f. Payroll	10
g. Overall Impressions	10
Parent Survey	10
Job Site Supervisor Survey	12
a. Satisfaction with Program Participants	12
b. Performance as Job Site Supervisor	15
c. Satisfaction with CETA Youth Advisors	15
d. Satisfaction with CETA Program	15
Youth Advisor Survey	16
a. Satisfaction with Program Participants	16
b. Satisfaction with Job Site Supervisors	16
c. Performance as Youth Advisor	16
d. Satisfaction with CETA Administration	19
e. Overall Satisfaction with Program	19
SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS	19
CONCLUSIONS	20
RECOMMENDATIONS	22
APPENDICES	23
Appendix A (CETA Work Sites)	23
Appendix B (Selected CETA Participant Comments)	27

33:07:80/81:002:lm

Page

Appendix C (Selected CETA Parent Comments) 31
Appendix D (Selected CETA Job Supervisor Comments) 33
Appendix E (Selected CETA Youth Advisor Comments) 37
Appendix F (Performance Standards and Goals Title IIB and Title IV) .. 38

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Employment Categories of CETA Student Participants	2
2	CETA Performance Standards	3
3	CETA Enrollment Goals by Economic Status	5
4	CETA Enrollment Goals by Demographic Characteristics	6
5	CETA Participant Questionnaire Results by Number and Percent ...	8
6	CETA Parent Questionnaire Results by Number and Percent	11
7	CETA Job Supervisor Questionnaire Results by Number and Percent	13
8	CETA Youth Advisor Questionnaire Results by Number and Percent	17

INTRODUCTION

The CETA Youth Employment and Training Program in the Phoenix Union High School District is designed to provide disadvantaged youth with job training and experience. During the 1979/80 school year, the project was funded by CETA Titles IIB and IV. The following services were offered to participants:

a. Outreach/recruitment
b. Intake
c. Referral to employability development services
d. Allowances/wage determination and processing
e. Counseling
f. Assessment
g. Orientation
h. Work experience
i. Job development/placement
j. Follow-up

Participants were employed at over 110 nonprofit public service agencies within the City of Phoenix (see Appendix A for a list of the agencies involved). Each student was allowed to work for 10 hours a week, and received wages of $3.10 per hour. Participants were employed in many different job classifications, as summarized in Table 1.

This report compares the achievements of the CETA program for 1979/80 against the original goals, as stated in the Titles IIB and IV grant proposals. Also presented are the results of surveys of CETA staff, participants, job site supervisors, and parents of participants regarding satisfaction with the program. Conclusions and recommendations based on the above data are given at the end of the report.

PROGRAM GOALS AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Both the Title IIB and Title IV proposals state that 100% of all authorized enrollments will be filled during the funding period. As of March 31, 1980 (the latest date for which statistics are currently available), both programs were well on their way towards meeting this goal: 506 out of a proposed 643 participants (79%) had been enrolled under CETA Title IV, and 570 out of a proposed 790 (72%) had been enrolled under Title IIB. Since some students were able to transfer from one program to the other, the unduplicated total of students served was 732.

Other specified performance standards were positive and negative termination rates, placement rates, and retention rates. As Table 2 shows, both the Title IIB and Title IV projects exceeded the minimum percentage of positive terminations, and had few negative terminations.* However, neither project placed as many participants as expected in unsubsidized employment. (Since almost all participants were high school students it probably was not realistic to expect many placements before the end of the school year.) Many of those

*All statistics are based on enrollment as of 3/31/80, as published 5/11/80 by the City of Phoenix, CETA administration.

Table 1

Employment Categories of CETA Student Participants

Activities clerk aide	1
Artist	1
Bindery aide	1
Bookstore aide	1
Cafeteria or food service aide	10
Carpenter's aide	1
Cashier	1
Clerical	157
Co-editor (newsletter)	2
Counselor aide	1
Dark room	1
Day care aide	27
Delivery	1
Engineering aide	2
Groundskeeper	1
Hopital escorts	3
Instructional aides	10
Inventory	1
Lab aide	1
Latch key coordinator aide	1
Library aide	13
Lifeguards	3
Mailroom helper	2
Maintenance aides	34
Mechanics	3
Medical records aide	1
P.E. equipment aide	10
Print shop offset machine operator	1
Printing/media aide	1
Recreation aide	72
Rehabilitation aide	1
Runner	1
Security aide	1
Special Education aide	16
Supply department distributor	1
Teach arts/crafts	6
Transportation aides	2
Utility workers	2
Vocational aide	3
Warehouse/stock	2
Woodworking aide	1
TOTAL	400

Table 2

CETA Performance Standards*

	Title IIB			Title IV		
Standard	Planned	Actual	Goal Met?	Planned	Actual	Goal Met?
Total Enrollment	790	570	On Schedule	643	506	On Schedule
Positive Terminations	At least 70%	76.7%	yes	At least 75%	82%	yes
Negative Terminations	No more than 30%	23.3%	yes	No more than 25%	18%	yes
Placed in unsubsidized employment	At least 10% of terminations	1.9%	no	At least 15% of terminations	6.6%	no
Other positive terminations	No more than 60% of terminations	74.8%	More than expected	No more than 85% of terminations	75.4%	yes
Retention rates:						
30 days	85%	100.0%	yes	80%	91.0%	yes
60 days	80%	100.0%	yes	70%	78.0%	yes
90 days	75%	--	yes	65%	67.0%	yes

*All figures are based on enrollment as of 3/31/80, as published 5/11/80 by City of Phoenix CETA administration.

who were placed apparently remained successfully employed: retention rates at 30, 60, and 90 days were above expectations.

ENROLLMENT GOALS

The major goal of both programs was to serve disadvantaged students. This goal was successfully met, as all but one of the participants were economically disadvantaged. The Title IV proposal additionally stipulated that no more than 20% of the enrollees could be between 70% and 85% of the Lower Living Standard Income Level. As only 2.2% of the participants were above 70% LLSIL, this goal was very well met. (See Table 3). Also under Title IV, at least 12% of the participants were to be welfare recipients, and 17.8% of the enrollees under Title IV funding were so classified.

As can be seen in Table 4, enrollment goals according to age, sex, and ethnic background of participants were all reached. The Title IV program also planned to enroll specified percentages of juvenile offenders, handicapped individuals, and high school dropouts. As CETA regulations permit a 15% variation around the expected percentages, sufficient enrollment in these categories was attained.

SURVEY RESULTS

Opinion surveys of CETA youth advisors, job site supervisors, participants and parents of participants were conducted to obtain their opinions about the program. Over 60% of the youth advisors (7 out of 11) and almost all job site supervisors (144 respondents) completed and returned their questionnaires.

Since students were enrolled in CETA at different times of the year and stayed in the program for varying lengths of time, no attempt was made to survey all participants or all parents of participants. Rather, a time with heavy enrollment was chosen (the week of December 10, 1979), and all participants in the program at that time were surveyed, along with their parents. A total of 291 students and 161 parents were surveyed.

Tables 5 through 8 summarize the opinions of students, parents, job supervisors, and youth advisors who replied to the surveys.

STUDENT SURVEY

The majority of student respondents (70.1%) were 16 or 17 years old and had previous experience working for CETA (74.6%). Their main occupations within the CETA program were in clerical (37.5%) and public service (24.0%) areas. Only 2.7% classified their work as mechanical, and 28.9% were in other fields. (See Table 5 for student survey results.)

Table 3

CETA Enrollment Goals by Economic Status*

	Title IIB			Title IV		
Participant Status	% Planned	% Actual	Goal Met?	% Planned	% Actual	Goal Met?
Economically Disadvantaged	100%	99.8%	yes	80%	100%	yes
Under 85% LLSIL but over 70% LLSIL	--	--	--	Less than 20%	2.2%	yes
Welfare recipients	--	--	--	12%	17.8%	yes

*All figures are based on enrollment as of 3/31/80, as published 5/11/80 by City of Phoenix CETA administration.

Table 4

CETA Enrollment Goals by Demographic Characteristics*

	Title IIB			Title IV		
Category	% Planned	% Actual	Goal Met?	% Planned	% Actual	Goal Met?
Sex						
Male	48%	40.9%	yes	45%	42.5%	yes
Female	52%	59.1%		55%	57.3%	
Age						
16-19 years	100%	99.3%	yes	95%	99.2%	yes
20-21 years	0%	.7%		5%	.8%	
Ethnic Origin						
Anglo	16%	22.1%	yes	27.6%	20.0%	yes
Black	50%	43.3%		35.2%	41.7%	
American Indian	8%	4.2%		5.0%	4.5%	
Hispanic	25%	29.1%		31.2%	32.6%	
Other	1%	1.2%		1.0%	1.2%	
Juvenile Offenders	--	--	--	5%	1.6%	yes
Handicapped	--	--	--	5%	11.9%	yes
Dropouts	--	--	--	10%	.4%	within permissable range

*All figures are based on enrollment as of 3/31/80, as published 5/11/80 by City of Phoenix CETA administration.

a. Attitudes Towards the Program

Participants were generally very positive about their CETA experience: 91.9% agreed or agreed strongly that they enjoyed their jobs, and only 1.7% did not agree (7.2% had no opinion or did not answer). Most participants also felt that their jobs were related to their interests (only 11.3% did not agree), which indicates that youth advisors were placing students carefully.

There were several benefits resulting from CETA jobs, according to participants. Over 80% reported having learned new skills, and over half (55.7%) were able to practice skills they had learned in school. Three-fourths of the respondents had gained confidence in their own abilities. Also, while 48.1% of the students thought it would have been hard for them to find a job without CETA, 84.5% felt it would be easier in the future because of the CETA work experience. Some students (40%) felt that the CETA job was one factor keeping them in school (although an equal number reported that it was not a factor). Finally, the experience of working in the "real world" helped participants make career choices: 37.1% of the respondents stated that they had changed their minds about the type of work they would like to do, and 33% were able to verify their original career choices.

On the personal side, most participants thought their parents were glad they were employed, and 34.7% reported improved family relations since beginning their CETA jobs.

b. Attitudes Towards Job Site Supervisors

Personnel from the employing agencies who immediately supervised each student were called job site supervisors, and were the people with whom CETA students had the most contact. According to survey respondents, the relationship between supervisor and participant was usually good. More than 80% of respondents thought their supervisor had been helpful to them on the job and that they were able to talk to their supervisors about problems as they arose. Supervisors also communicated to participants about the quality of their work (82.1% of respondents agreed or agreed strongly with this statement). Over 75% of the students felt that their job supervisors were happy with their work.

c. Attitudes Towards CETA Youth Advisors

The CETA youth advisors placed students in their CETA jobs and monitored progress at the job site through regular visits and special contacts, when necessary. Most students (85.6%) reported seeing their youth advisors regularly.

Participants expressed the same positive opinions about youth advisors as they did about job supervisors. Approximately 90% stated that their youth advisors were helpful to them, that they could talk to the youth advisors about any problems that arose, and that youth advisors had informed them about payroll procedures and the expectations of their employers. According to 13.4% of respondents, youth advisors did not contact them if they were absent from work more than once. However, this is due primarily to a delay in school reporting of attendance statistics, which are often not available until a student has already missed several days of work and school. Finally, youth advisors gave career counseling only to juniors and seniors, as freshmen and sophomores had little opportunity to fit career-oriented elective classes into their schedule. Therefore, 29.2% of the participants reported receiving no career counseling.

Table 5

Comprenensive Employment Training Act
CETA Participant Questionnaire Results (N = 291)
By Number and Percent

		Age	Number	Percent
1.	My age is	14 years old	15	(5.2%)
		15 years old	36	(12.4%)
		16 years old	107	(36.8%)
		17 years old	97	(33.3%)
		18 years old	23	(7.9%)
		19 years old	3	(1.0%)
		21 years old	1	(.3%)
		No Answer	9	(3.1%)

2. I have 217 (74.6%)
   I have not 54 (18.6%)
   } previously worked at a CETA job.
   No Answer 20 (6.9%)

3.	The type of work I do at my job is:	Clerical (office)	109	(37.5%)
		Mechanical	8	(2.7%)
		Helping People	70	(24.0%)
		Other	84	(28.9%)
		No Answer	20	(6.9%)

		Agree Strongly	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	No Answer
4.	My payroll check comes on time and is correct.	151 51.9%	104 35.7%	17 5.8%	16 5.5%	0 0	3 1.0
5.	I enjoy my CETA job.	128 44.0%	137 47.1%	19 6.5%	3 1.0%	2 .7%	2 .7%
6.	My job is related to my interests.	72 24.7%	123 42.3%	56 19.2%	26 8.9%	7 2.4%	7 2.4%
7.	I think it will be easier for me to get a job in the future now that I have had this CETA job.	99 34.0%	147 50.5%	36 12.4%	5 1.7%	2 .7%	2 .7%
8.	I see my Youth Advisor regularly.	87 29.9%	162 55.7%	24 8.2%	11 3.8%	1 .3%	6 2.1%
9.	My Youth Advisor is helpful to me.	121 41.6%	142 48.8%	15 5.2%	3 1.0%	1 .3%	9 3.1%
10.	If I am absent from work more than once, my Youth Advisor contacts me.	51 17.5%	110 37.8%	87 29.9%	30 10.3%	9 3.1%	4 1.4%
11.	I was given enough information by my Youth Advisor about payroll and what was expected of me at my job.	143 49.1%	130 44.7%	6 2.1%	7 2.4%	2 .7%	3 1.0%
12.	My Job Supervisor is helpful to me on the job.	120 41.2%	138 47.4%	22 7.6%	5 1.7%	4 1.4%	2 .7%

OVER

	Agree Strongly	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	No Answer
13. My Job Supervisor lets me know if my work is satisfactory.	113 38.8%	126 43.3%	33 11.3%	13 4.5%	3 1.0%	3 1.0%
14. My Job Supervisor is happy with my work.	102 35.1%	127 43.6%	54 18.6%	1 .3%	2 .7	5 1.7%
15. I have learned new skills on this job.	107 36.8%	126 43.3%	33 11.3%	15 5.2%	5 1.7%	5 1.7%
16. I am staying in school partly because of my CETA job.	50 17.2%	61 21.0%	57 19.6%	60 20.6%	57 19.6%	6 2.1%
17. It would be hard for me to find a job without CETA.	55 18.9%	85 29.2%	76 26.1%	50 17.2%	16 5.5%	9 3.1%
18. I am almost always on time for work.	136 46.7%	121 41.6%	22 7.6%	7 2.4%	3 1.0%	2 .7
19. I skip work occasionally because I have other things to do.	4 1.4%	26 8.9%	25 8.6%	125 43.0%	100 34.4%	11 3.8%
20. I think I have good work habits.	88 30.2%	175 60.1%	13 4.5%	4 1.4%	1 .3%	10 3.4%
21. My opinions about what type of work I would like to do have changed since I started my CETA job.	36 12.4%	72 24.7%	73 25.1%	71 24.4%	25 8.6%	14 4.8%
22. I get along better with my family since I started my job.	30 10.3%	71 24.4%	109 37.5%	44 15.1%	20 6.9%	17 5.8%
23. My parents are glad that I have my CETA job.	118 40.5%	129 44.3%	30 10.3%	2 .7%	0 0	12 4.1%
24. My CETA Youth Advisor has counseled me about classes to take for the career I am interested in.	40 13.7%	82 28.2%	71 24.4%	72 24.7%	13 4.5%	13 4.5%
25. I get along well with the other people at work.	135 46.4%	129 44.3%	13 4.5%	1 .3%	3 1.0%	10 3.4%
26. Transportation to my job is a problem for me.	10 3.4%	31 10.7%	28 9.6%	116 39.9%	91 31.3%	15 5.2%
27. Things I learned in school are important in my job.	46 15.8%	116 39.9%	60 20.6%	44 15.1%	13 4.5%	12 4.1%
28. I have had a lot of problems on my job.	9 3.1%	22 7.6%	31 10.7%	121 41.6%	92 31.6%	16 5.5%
29. If any problems came up, I could talk to my Job Site Supervisor about them.	92 31.6%	142 48.8%	30 10.3%	11 3.8%	5 1.7%	11 3.8%
30. If any problems came up, I could talk to my Youth Advisor about them.	104 35.7%	152 52.2%	20 6.9%	4 1.4%	0 0	11 3.8%
31. If any problems came up, I could talk to my School Counselor about them.	53 18.2%	138 47.4%	53 18.2%	25 8.6%	13 4.5%	9 3.1%
32. I feel more confident in my abilities since I started my CETA job.	77 26.5%	142 48.8%	45 15.5%	9 3.1%	3 1.0%	15 5.2%
33. I would like to work in a CETA program next year if possible.	143 49.1%	89 30.6%	28 9.6%	9 3.1%	3 1.0%	19 6.5%

34. I go to: Alhambra 11 (3.8%); Browne 19 (6.5%); Cyesis 7 (2.4%); Desiderata I 3 (1.0%); Desiderata II 2 (.7%); East 25 (8.6%); Hayden 17 (5.8%); Maryvale 35 (12.0%); North 16 (5.5%); South 49 (16.8%); Camelback 3(1.0%); Union/AVC 63 (21.6%); West 17 (5.8%); Other 6 (2.1%); and No Answer 18 (6.2%).

35. Overall, I think the CETA program is: Excellent 142 (48.8%); Good 103 (35.4%); Adequate 27 (9.3%); No Answer 19 (6.5%)

LW:gg
3-18-80

d. Participant Work Habits

In their own opinions, CETA students were good workers. They stated that they were almost always on time (88.3%), that they had good work habits (90.3%), that they got along with others at work (90.7%), and that they did NOT skip work because they had other things to do (only 10.3% reported missing work for this reason). Interestingly, the older the student, the better his/her work habits, according to self-report.

Most students (73.2%) felt they had not had many problems on the job. As stated above, when problems did occur students felt able to talk to their youth advisors and job supervisors about them. (They also felt that their regular school counselors were accessible to discuss problems if necessary - see question 31.)

e. Transportation

Few participants (14.1%) reported that getting to work was a problem for them

f. Payroll

Since payroll procedures have sometimes been seen as a problem by participants in Phoenix Union High School District CETA programs, these students were asked whether their payroll checks were correct and on time. The overwhelming majority responded that their checks were accurate, and had been received when expected. (Only 5.5% disagreed with this statement and no one disagreed strongly.) Therefore, payroll does not appear to have been the problem it was with the shorter summer CETA program.

g. Overall Impressions

The CETA participants who responded to this survey rated the program very highly. Almost half (48.8%) saw is as excellent, one-third more (35.4%) rated it as good, and 9.3% reported that it was adequate. None of the participants felt that the program was "poor" or "very poor" (6.5% did not answer this question). Many participants (79.7%) expressed a desire to work in a CETA program again next year, if possible.

The good things about the CETA program as seen by participants were the opportunity to work while still going to school, the assistance in obtaining a job, and the work experience and training, which students felt would help them obtain jobs in the future. Negative aspects of the program were being allowed to work only ten hours per week, and the low pay rate. (See Appendix B for participant comments.)

PARENT SURVEY

Table 6 shows the results of the parent survey. The majority had children who were 16 or 17 years old and had been in a CETA program at least once before. Many (83.5%) reported that their children had spoken to them about the training they were receiving through CETA, and over three-quarters of the respondents indicated that they understood how the CETA program operated (8.0% did not understand). In general, parent opinions corresponded very well with

Table 6

Comprehensive Employment Training Act
CETA Parent Questionnaire Results (N = 161)
By Number and Percent

1. My son/daughter in the CETA program is

Age	Number	Percent
14 years old	17	(10.6%)
15 years old	31	(19.3%)
16 years old	51	(31.7%)
17 years old	48	(29.8%)
18 years old	9	(5.6%)
No Answer	5	(3.1%)

2. My son/daughter has 117 (72.7%) worked for CETA before.
   has not 35 (21.7%)
   No Answer 9 (5.6%)

	Agree Strongly	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	No Answer
3. My child likes his/her CETA job.	84 52.2%	69 42.9%	6 3.7%	0 0	0 0	2 1.2%
4. The CETA job has improved my child's work habits.	56 34.8%	80 49.7%	18 11.2%	4 2.5%	1 .6%	2 1.2%
5. The CETA job is one reason my child stays in school.	16 9.9%	35 21.7%	31 19.3%	45 28.0%	30 18.6%	4 2.5%
6. I understand how the CETA program operates.	37 23.0%	86 53.4%	23 14.3%	11 6.8%	2 1.2%	2 1.2%
7. I like the idea of my child having a job.	102 63.4%	57 35.4%	1 .6%	1 .6%	0 0	0 0
8. Having a job has helped my child do better in school.	24 14.9%	77 47.8%	37 23.0%	17 10.6%	2 1.2%	4 2.5%
9. My child is more self-confident since starting his/her job.	63 39.1%	72 44.7%	15 9.3%	10 6.2%	1 .6%	0 0
10. Having a job has helped my child get along better with the family.	29 18.0%	68 42.2%	38 23.6%	18 11.2%	7 4.3%	1 .6%
11. The CETA job seems to be related to my child's interests.	41 25.5%	89 55.3%	18 11.2%	10 6.2%	1 .6%	2 1.2%
12. My child has learned new skills at his/her CETA job.	53 32.9%	81 50.3%	19 11.8%	6 3.7%	0 0	2 1.2%
13. My child has mentioned the training he/she is getting on the CETA job.	43 26.7%	93 57.8%	10 6.2%	10 6.2%	1 .6%	4 2.5%
14. I would allow my child to be in the Phoenix Union High School District CETA program next year if he/she qualified and was interested.	97 60.2%	59 36.6%	3 1.9%	1 .6%	0 0	1 .6%
15. Someone from the CETA program has advised my child what type of classes to take for the career he/she is interested in.	21 13.0%	34 21.1%	55 34.2%	38 23.6%	8 5.0%	5 3.1%
	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Answer
16. My overall impression of the CETA program is:	81 50.3%	63 39.1%	9 5.6%	2 1.2%	0 0	6 3.7%

participants' self-reports of interest and achievement in their CETA jobs.

The 161 parents who answered the survey felt that CETA had been beneficial to the students involved. Almost all (95.1%) stated that they believed the participants liked their jobs. More than 80% had seen improvements in their children's work habits as well as in their self-confidence. They also reported that students had learned new skills. The majority (62.7%) thought that having a job helped their children to do better in school, although not as many (31.6%) believed that the CETA job was one factor in keeping students in school. Almost twice as many parents (60.2%) as participants (34.7%) indicated that having a job helped particpants get along better with their families. This could be because particpants' attitudes towards family members had improved along with their self-confidence, or it might be that parents saw their children in a more favorable light once they were employed.

Some parents (28.6%) stated that the CETA staff had not given their children advice about what classes to take for the careers they were interested in. These were probably the parents of freshmen and sophomores, who received no career counseling. However, the CETA jobs themselves were seen as related to participants' interests by 80.8% of the parents who responded.

Parents gave overwhelming endorsement to the idea of their children having jobs (98.8% agreed or agreed strongly that they like the idea), and to the CETA program in particular. Only one parent stated that he/she would not allow his/her child to participate in CETA again next year if qualified. Finally, half of the parents rated the CETA program as excellent overall, and an additional 39.1% rated it as good. Approximately 5% felt it was adequate and only 1.2% rated it as poor. None of the parents thought the program was very poor. Many commented that the program gave students good training for the future as well as "keeping them off the streets" and out of trouble. The fact that students were able to earn money to buy some of their own necessities was also very important. Parents' comments are reproduced in Appendix C.

JOB SITE SUPERVISOR SURVEY

Three-fourths of the 144 job supervisors who answered the questionnaire had previous experience as CETA job supervisors. Most of them (75.7%) supervised from one to three CETA students at any one time, the majority performing clerical work.

a. Satisfaction with Program Participants

Job supervisors thought highly of their CETA student employees. They confirmed participants' self-reports by agreeing that participants showed good work habits, were generally on time, and did not miss many days of work. Over 80% thought participants had learned new skills on the job. Only 8 supervisors (5.6%) were dissatisfied with the performance of their CETA students. (See Table 7.)

Participants also had positive attitudes, according to their supervisors. Over 80% of the supervisors stated that CETA students seemed interested in their work and that they got along well with regular employees.

Table 7

Comprehensive Employment Training Act
CETA Job Supervisor Questionnaire Results (N = 144)
By Number and Percent

1. I have 108 (75.0%) / I have not 31 (21.5%) previously supervised PUHSD CETA student workers.
   No Answer 5 (3.5%)

2. I directly supervise - 1-3 CETA student workers = 109 (75.7%); Over 3 CETA student workers = 19 (13.2%); No Answer = 16 (11.1%)

3. The students I supervise work in the following area:

Clerical	86	(59.7%)
Mechanical	5	(3.5%)
Public Service	16	(11.1%)
Other	30	(20.8%)
No Answer	7	(4.9%)

	Agree Strongly	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	No Answer
4. Most of the PUHSD CETA students I supervise this year show good work habits.	36 25.0%	86 59.7%	6 4.2%	11 7.6%	0 0	5 3.5%
5. My CETA students do not miss many days of work.	42 29.2%	78 54.2%	4 2.8%	17 11.8%	1 .7%	2 1.4%
6. The CETA students are generally at work on time.	42 29.2%	90 62.5%	3 2.1%	4 2.8%	2 1.4%	3 2.1%
7. The Youth Advisor drops by the job site on a regular basis.	33 22.9%	71 49.3%	11 7.6%	20 13.9%	6 4.2%	3 2.1%
8. I am generally satisfied with the job performance of my CETA students.	51 35.4%	77 53.5%	6 4.2%	8 5.6%	0 0	2 1.4%
9. The goals of the CETA program were explained to me.	24 16.7%	91 63.2%	9 6.3%	18 12.5%	0 0	2 1.4%
10. The CETA students seem interested in their work.	35 24.3%	87 60.4%	14 9.7%	6 4.2%	0 0	2 1.4%
11. The CETA students have learned new skills on their jobs.	36 25.0%	91 63.2%	11 7.6%	4 2.8%	0 0	2 1.4%
12. The CETA students need too much supervision even after their training.	2 1.4%	15 10.4%	16 11.1%	82 56.9%	23 16.0%	6 4.2%
13. The payroll procedure works adequately.	15 10.4%	93 64.6%	25 17.4%	9 6.3%	0 0	2 1.4%
14. I enjoy being a CETA Supervisor.	47 32.6%	74 51.4%	19 13.2%	0 0	1 .7%	3 2.1%
15. I feel I am available to talk to the CETA students if they have problems on the job.	51 35.4%	88 61.1%	2 1.4%	2 1.4%	0 0	1 .7%
16. The CETA students were placed as closely to their job interests as possible.	26 18.1%	76 52.8%	25 17.4%	5 3.5%	2 1.4%	10 6.9%
17. The Youth Advisor is available to work out job-related problems with the students or with me.	29 20.1%	77 53.5%	24 16.7%	6 4.2%	1 .7%	7 4.9%
18. I would recommend my CETA workers to someone else for employment.	43 29.9%	75 52.1%	9 6.3%	3 2.1%	2 1.4%	12 8.3%

OVER

	Agree Strongly	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	No Answer
19. The CETA program is well run in general.	15 10.4%	64 44.4%	46 31.9%	5 3.5%	6 4.2%	8 5.6%
20. I would participate again as a CETA Job Site Supervisor.	44 30.6%	80 55.6%	12 8.3%	1 .7%	1 .7%	6 4.2%
21. I fill out the student time sheets and have them ready for the Youth Advisor to pick up at the time specified.	29 20.1%	91 63.2%	11 7.6%	5 3.5%	7 4.9%	1 .7%
22. The CETA program improves the employability of the students involved.	38 26.4%	71 49.3%	27 18.8%	1 .7%	1 .7%	6 4.2%
23. My PUHSD CETA students rate me as a good supervisor.	18 12.5%	48 33.3%	61 42.4%	3 2.1%	0 0	14 9.7%
24. It is hard to find work to keep the CETA students busy.	1 .7%	12 8.3%	4 2.8%	87 60.4%	31 21.5%	9 6.3%
25. The CETA students get along well with the regular employees.	38 26.4%	88 61.1%	10 6.9%	1 .7%	0 0	7 4.9%
26. The CETA orientation procedure adequately prepared the students for their job (payroll information, work habits expected, etc.).	15 10.4%	71 49.3%	36 25.0%	13 9.0%	3 2.1%	6 4.2%

---

27. My PUHSD CETA students are from:	Alhambra	8	(5.6%)
	BACE	2	(1.4%)
	Browne	8	(5.6%)
	Camelback	4	(2.8%)
	Central	4	(2.8%)
	Cyesis	4	(2.8%)
	Desiderata	3	(2.1%)
	East	10	(6.9%)
	Hayden	11	(7.6%)
	Maryvale	17	(11.8%)
	North	13	(9.0%)
	South	10	(6.9%)
	Union/AVC	28	(19.4%)
	West	6	(4.2%)
	No Answer	16	(11.1%)

	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	No Answer
28. My overall view of the CETA program is:	29 20.1%	76 52.8%	23 16.0%	5 3.5%	1 .7%	10 6.9%

LW:gg
3-18-80

It might be expected that high school students on their first jobs would require a large amount of attention and assistance from their supervisors. However, this was apparently not the case. Three-fourths of the supervisors disagreed with the statement "The CETA students need too much supervision even after their training," and only 9% felt it was hard to find work to keep the CETA students busy. That the students were seen as worthwhile employees is also attested to by the fact that 82% of the supervisors who answered the survey expressed a willingness to recommend their CETA students to someone else for employment in the future.

b. Performance as Job Site Supervisor

Most (96.2%) job supervisors indicated that they were available to talk to the CETA students if any problems came up. As previously mentioned, students did feel they could talk to their supervisors when necessary, so the relationship between the two groups appears to have been generally good. However, more than half (52.1%) of the supervisors had no opinion or no answer when asked whether their students rated them as good supervisors.

c. Satisfaction with CETA Youth Advisors

Three-fourths of the job site supervisors agreed or agreed strongly that the CETA youth advisors dropped by the job site on a regular basis. Youth advisors were also available when necessary to work out job-related problems with the student or supervisor, according to 83.6% of the supervisors.

d. Satisfaction with CETA Program

The goals of the CETA program had been adequately explained to most supervisors, however, 12.5% did not feel that they had received such an explanation. Approximately the same percentage (11.1%) did not think students had been given enough information about payroll procedures or behavior expected at work. These were apparently minor points, though, as the majority of supervisors thought the CETA program was well run in general (54.8%), that students were placed as closely to their job interests as possible (70.9%), and that the program improved the employability of the students involved (75.7%). Payroll procedures also were reported to have worked adequately, even though 8.4% of the job supervisors indicated they did not always fill out time sheets and have them ready for youth advisors to pick up and turn in.

Overall, job site supervisors felt the CETA experience was worthwhile: 84.0% enjoyed being CETA supervisors, and 86.2% indicated they would participate again in the future. Half (52.8%) rated the program as good, 20.1% thought it was excellent, 16% felt it was adequate, 3.5% rated it as poor, and one supervisor thought it was very poor. (Ten supervisors did not answer this question.)

The strengths of the CETA program as seen by job site supervisors were the opportunity for students to receive work experience and job training, and for nonprofit agencies to hire employees they otherwise could not afford. Program weaknesses were the small number of hours students were allowed to work and the fact that there was too small a pool of student workers from which to choose. A few supervisors felt that some CETA students (usually NOT their own) were not really interested in working. (See Appendix D for job site supervisors' comments.)

YOUTH ADVISOR SURVEY

Seven of the eleven youth advisors (63.6%) answered this survey. Their responses are given in Table 8. In general, they approved of the CETA program although they were somewhat less positive about it than participants or job site supervisors.

a. Satisfaction with Program Participants

All but one youth advisor (85.7%) were in agreement that CETA students were generally on time for work and developed good work habits while in the program. Only one advisor felt that students tended to skip work ocassionally if they had "something better to do," although one more had no opinion on this subject. According to five of the seven respondents (71.4%), student attitude and motivation were good, however the other two advisors did not share this opinion. While these numbers are small and percentages may therefore be deceptive, it appears that youth advisors did not see participant motivation and attitude in as positive a light as do job supervisors. This may be because advisors usually do not observe participants while they are working, or that attitudes on the job are more positive than conversations with youth advisors would indicate. Or perhaps the two youth advisors who felt student attitude and motivation were poor had a greater number of the less well motivated students in their caseloads. At any rate, all but one of the youth advisors did feel that job site supervisors were reasonably happy with the CETA students who worked for them.

b. Satisfaction with Job Site Supervisors

These survey results show that job site supervisors were highly thought of by the CETA youth advisors. There was unaimous agreement among respondents that supervisors were cooperative and that they reported problems to the youth advisors when necessary. Only one youth advisor disagreed with the statement "Job site supervisors generally train students adequately for their jobs." However, two advisors felt that job supervisors did not always fill out student time sheets by the specified date. This feeling was consistent with the self-reports of 8.4% of the supervisors, as stated above. All of the youth advisors agreed that CETA students were reasonably happy with their job site supervisors.

c. Performance as Youth Advisor

Youth advisors were most positive that they were available to talk to their students about problems at work: 71.4% agreed strongly and 28.6% agreed with this statement. As previously mentioned, 87.9% of the participants did feel able to talk to their youth advisors. Participants and youth advisors also agreed that participants had been informed about payroll procedures and work habits. However, while all of the youth advisors reported maintaining contact with their students on a regular basis, some students (4.1%) did not feel this had occurred. Only one youth advisor and 13.4% of participants disagreed with the statement that youth advisors contacted students when they were absent more than once. (Almost 30% of participants had no opinion on this question; apparently they were not absent often enough to find out.)

Table 8

Comprehensive Employment Training Act
CETA Youth Advisor Questionnaire Results (N = 7)
By Number and Percent

1. I supervise _____ PUHSD CETA students. 35-39 - 1 45-49 - 2
40-44 - 2 50-54 - 2

	Agree Strongly	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
2. Inservice training for Youth Advisors is adequate.	0 0	4 57.1%	1 14.3%	2 28.6%	0 0
3. There are adequate promotional opportunities for the staff within the CETA organization.	0 0	2 28.6%	2 28.6%	2 28.6%	1 14.3%
4. I understand the management system or plan within CETA at the local level.	1 14.3%	6 85.7%	0 0	0 0	0 0
5. The CETA management system works well. (local level)	1 14.3%	3 42.9%	2 28.6%	1 14.3%	0 0
6. The CETA administration gives me good support at the local level.	0 0	3 42.9%	2 28.6%	1 14.3%	1 14.3%
7. Facilities and equipment provided by CETA are adequate.	2 28.6%	4 57.1%	1 14.3%	0 0	0 0
8. My case load is the right size.	2 28.6%	3 42.9%	0 0	1 14.3%	1 14.3%
9. I am satisfied with the screening/intake process for CETA.	0 0	3 42.9%	0 0	3 42.9%	1 14.3%
10. Payroll procedures for the CETA students are satisfactory.	0 0	2 28.6%	1 14.3%	1 14.3%	3 42.9%
11. I maintain contact with my students on a regular basis.	3 42.9%	4 57.1%	0 0	0 0	0 0
12. CETA students are placed as closely as possible to their vocational interests.	3 42.9%	4 57.1%	0 0	0 0	0 0
13. Students generally develop good work habits in the program.	2 28.6%	4 57.1%	0 0	1 14.3%	0 0
14. Students generally are motivated to work and have good attitudes toward their jobs.	2 28.6%	3 42.9%	0 0	2 28.6%	0 0
15. Students tend to skip work occasionally if they have "something better to do."	0 0	1 14.3%	1 14.3%	3 42.9%	2 28.6%
16. Students are generally on time for work.	1 14.3%	5 71.4%	0 0	1 14.3%	0 0
17. Job Site Supervisors are generally cooperative.	2 28.6%	5 71.4%	0 0	0 0	0 0

OVER

	Agree Strongly	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Disagree Strongly
18. Job Site Supervisors fill out time sheets on time.	2 28.6%	3 42.9%	0 0	2 28.6%	0 0
19. Job Site Supervisors generally train students adequately for their jobs.	2 28.6%	4 57.1%	0 0	1 14.3%	0 0
20. Job Site Supervisors report problems to me.	2 28.6%	5 71.4%	0 0	0 0	0 0
21. If a student is absent from work more than once, I will contact him/her to find out why.	0 0	6 85.7%	0 0	1 14.3%	0 0
22. I am available to talk to the students about problems at work.	5 71.4%	2 28.6%	0 0	0 0	0 0
23. CETA students seem reasonably happy with their Job Site Supervisors.	3 42.9%	4 57.1%	0 0	0 0	0 0
24. Job Site Supervisors seem reasonably happy with their CETA students.	2 28.6%	4 57.1%	0 0	1 14.3%	0 0
25. Students learn new skills on their jobs.	1 14.3%	5 71.4%	0 0	1 14.3%	0 0
26. The experienced CETA students are prepared to compete in the job market after they leave school.	1 14.3%	5 71.4%	0 0	1 14.3%	0 0
27. I inform my students about payroll procedures and work habits for their jobs.	4 57.1%	3 42.9%	0 0	0 0	0 0
	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor
28. My overall impression of the CETA program is:	2 28.6%	3 42.9%	1 14.3%	1 14.3%	0 0

LW:gg
3-18-80

d. Satisfaction with CETA Administration

Youth advisor opinions about CETA administration varied. All advisors indicated that they understood the CETA management plan at the local level, while half (57.2%) agreed that it worked well and less than half (42.9%) felt that the local administration gave them good support. Only 28.6% thought there were adequate promotional opportunities available. (It should be noted that 28.6% of the youth advisors indicated no opinion on these questions, so that the number of either positive or negative responses was very small.) Opinion was also divided on caseload size and the adequacy of inservice training, although more advisors responded positively than negatively. Facilities and equipment provided by CETA were generally seen as adequate.

e. Overall Satisfaction with Program

Where benefits to the students enrolled were considered, youth advisors felt that CETA was worthwhile. All but one advisor agreed that students learned new skills on the job and that the program prepared participants to compete on the job market after they left school. Advisors also agreed that students were placed as closely as possible to their vocational interests. However, two aspects of the program were unsatisfactory to the majority of youth advisors. According to 57.2% of respondents, both payroll procedures and the screening/intake process were inadequate.

Overall, 42.9% of the youth advisors rated the program as good, and 28.6% rated it excellent. One advisor saw the program as adequate, and one thought it was poor. None gave it a "very poor" rating.

Strengths of the program were listed as the opportunities for disadvantaged students to earn money, learn good work habits, and acquire job skills. Program weaknesses included too much paperwork and payroll management. Suggestions for program improvement involved reducing caseload size and cutting down on paperwork. One youth advisor commented that recent changes in the program have already resulted in more manageable caseloads. Youth advisor comments are reproduced in Appendix E.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

All groups surveyed indicated that the CETA program helped participants to develop good work habits and learn new skills. Relations between participants and their supervisors were seen as productive by all concerned. Youth advisors felt that they placed their clients as closely as possible to their career interests, and participants, parents and job supervisors concurred. Students liked their jobs and expressed favorable opinions of both their job supervisors and their youth advisors. Parents were glad to see their children employed and reported noticing improvements in their schoolwork and family relations. Job supervisors thought the CETA program was well run, enjoyed being supervisors, and expressed willingness to particpate again in the future. Youth advisors reported that job supervisors were cooperative and trained students adequately. Overall, the majority of participants, job site supervisors, and parents rated the program as excellent. The majority of youth advisors rated it as good.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The Phoenix Union High School District Titles IIB and IV CETA programs successfully fulfilled their goals for total number and percent of disadvantaged youth enrolled.

2. All goals for age, sex, and ethnic distribution of participants were met.

3. Under Title IV funding, the expected percentages of handicapped individuals, dropouts, and juvenile offenders were served.

4. Fewer participants than planned were placed in unsubsidized employment.

5. Retention rates for those participants placed in unsubsidized employment met or exceed project goals.

6. PARTICIPANT OPINIONS: Student CETA participants liked their jobs and saw them as related to their interests. They reported learning new skills and gaining self-confidence. One-third made new career choices as a result of their jobs.

   Most participants thought their job supervisors and CETA youth advisors were helpful. They felt comfortable talking to either an advisor or a supervisor about job-related problems.

7. PARENT OPINIONS: Parents of participants generally reported that their children showed improved work habits and self-confidence. They were also of the opinion that participants had learned new skills, improved their schoolwork, and gotten along better with their families since being in the CETA program.

8. JOB SITE SUPERVISOR OPINIONS: Participants had good work habits and attitudes, according to their job site supervisors. Supervisors did not feel that participants needed excessive amounts of supervision, nor did they miss work often.

   Almost all supervisors reported that they enjoyed supervising CETA students, and would do so again if asked.

   Job supervisors agreed that youth advisors dropped by job sites on a regular basis, and were available to discuss any problems that occurred.

9. YOUTH ADVISOR OPINIONS: The majority of youth advisors believed that the work habits and attitudes of CETA participants were good. They also agreed that job site supervisors were cooperative, and trained students adequately for their jobs.

   Advisors understood the operation of the local CETA mangement, but some felt it did not work as well as it should, and many felt promotional opportunities were limited.

10. Payroll procedures were seen as a problem by youth advisors. However, job supervisors and participants were satisfied with the payroll arrangements.

11. The majority opinion of all groups of respondents was that the opportunities for students to learn good work habits and job skills were the strongest points of the CETA program.

12. When asked to list weak points in the program, many CETA participants and some job supervisors wished that the students were allowed to work more than ten hours per week. Other supervisors wished they had a larger "pool" of student applicants from which to choose, and a few thought some CETA students were not really interested in working. Youth advisors listed excessive paperwork and poor payroll management as problems.

13. The majority of participants, job site supervisors, and parents gave the program an overally rating of "excellent." The majority of youth advisors rated it "good."

Recommendations for program improvement are provided on the next page of this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A computer-assisted system of record-keeping and data mangement should be developed for this program. Phoenix CETA administration is unable to provide the Phoenix Union High School District CETA program with weekly or bi-weekly statistics on enrollment, and the size of the program no longer permits simple hand calculations. Enrollment demographics are of vital interest to program staff and evaluators in determining whether the program is meeting its goals. Updated figures should be available on a regular basis.

*2. CETA youth advisors should continue to investigate new job sites, in order to match as many participants as possible to their career interests, as far as the availability of public transportation allows.

3. Since most participants are non-graduating students, reduce the expected goal for permanent unsubsidized placements.

*4. Develop more effective reporting procedures for those participants who are placed in unsubsidized employment.

*5. Wherever possible, investigate the possibility of reducing or eliminating excessive paperwork by using computer-assisted data management and by reviewing the reports, forms, and other documents currently in use.

6. Expand or re-organize orientation programs for participants, stressing work habits, job responsibilities, local and national labor market forecasts, and payroll procedures.

7. Develop more extensive orientation materials for job site supervisors.

*8. Continue the attempt to reduce youth advisor caseloads.

9. Program management and staff should discuss staff suggestions for program changes in the areas of payroll mangement and general program operations, and implement those which are feasible.

10. If funding allows, permit students to work more than 10 hours per week (contingent on the maintainance of satisfactory school performance).

11. Over the last several years, the PUHSD CETA program has been refined. It is consistently reported to be a good to excellent program by youth advisors, participants, job supervisors, and parents. Evaluation planning should now begin to focus in on specific problem areas, such as participant orientation and data management, to assist program management and staff in continued program development.

*Recommendations carried over from FY 77/78 or 78/79 CETA evaluation reports.

APPENDIX A

(CETA Work Sites)

Appendix A

CETA Work Sites

Adventure Center
3rd Street & Oak

Alhambra High School
3829 W. Camelback

American Federation of State,
County, & Municipal Employers
807 W. Adams

AZ Assoc. Retarded Children
5610 S. Central

Arizona Day Care Center
3342 W. Roosevelt

Arizona Education Assoc.
2102 W. Indian School Road

Arizona Health Service Print Shop
411 N. 24th Street

AZ Recreation Center for
Handicapped
3800 West Grand Avenue

AZ State Liquor/License Dept.
1645 W. Jefferson

Arizona Training Program
3727 E. McDowell

Barry School
2533 N. 60th Ave.

Bethune School
1510 S. 15th Avenue

Borman Junior High
3637 N. 55th Avenue

Broadway House
2201 E. Broadway

Butlers Boys Club
1632 E. Moreland

Camelback High School
4612 N. 28th Street

Carl Hayden High School
3333 W. Roosevelt

Cash School
3851 W. Roeser Road

CASP School
6339 W. Monte Vista

Central High School
4525 N. Central Avenue

Central Park
1st & Tonto

Child Protective Service
3003 N. 35th Avenue

City of Phoenix:
Attorney's Office
251 W. Washington

Benefits, Insurance
10 N. 3rd Avenue

City Treasury
251 W. Washington

Employment Services
10 N. 3rd Avenue

General Services Adminstration
230 N. 1st Avenue

Mail Room
251 W. Washington

Parks and Recreation
125 E. Washington

Personnel
10 N. 3rd Avenue

Prosecutors Office
620 W. Washington

South East Service Center
2525 East Hess

CETA Work Sites

Civic East Day Care
1728 E. Monroe

Classroom Teachers Assoc.
2102 W. Indian School

Coffelt Park
1510 S. 19th Drive

Community Youth Center
1002 N. 35th Avenue

County Hospital
Medical Records
2601 E. Roosevelt

Crisis Nursery
2405 E. Fillmore

Cyesis Center (Day Care)
2801 N. 31st Street

Cyesis West
3415 N. 59th Avenue

DeAnza School
91st Avenue & Campbell

Department of Economic Security
1720 W. Madison

D.E.S. (Quality Control)
1825 E. Garfield

Desert Valley High School
2636 W. Montebello

District Administrative Office
2526 W. Osborn

East High School
515 N. 48th Street

Eastlake Park
16th Street & Jefferson

Emerson School
7th Street & Palm Lane

Friendly House
801 S. 1st Avenue

Golden Gate Settlement
1701 E. Grant

Good Samaritan
215 E. McDowell

Hacienda de los Angeles
1402 E. South Mountain Avenue

Harmon Park
5th Avenue & Yavapai

Harris School
2252 N. 55th Avenue

Hayden Park
322 W. Tamarisk

Holiday Park
66th Avenue & Campbell

Holmes Boys Club
1601 W. Sherman

Human Resource Service #1
4732 S. Central

Isaac District Office
4202 W. McDowell

John F. Kennedy School
6825 S. 10th Street

Julian School
2149 E. Carver

Kee-N-Bah (Day Care)
1210 E. Virginia

Keickhefer Boys Club
548 W. Southern Avenue

Lowell School
1210 S. 1st Avenue

Luke Air Force Base
Litchfield Road

Luke Krohn
1940½ E. Villa

CETA Work Sites

Main Library
12 East McDowell

Maricopa County
112 S. 3rd Avenue

Maricopa Tech
106 E. Washington

Maryvale Golf Course
4302 N. 59th Avenue

Maryvale High School
3415 N. 59th Avenue

Maryvale Hospital
5102 W. Campbell

Maryvale Park
51st Avenue & Campbell

Maryvale Rehabilitation
3835 N. 75th Avenue

Maryvale Youth Center
2929 N. 75th Avenue

Matthew Henson
1003-A S. 9th Avenue

Memorial Hospital
1201 S. 7th Avenue

MEPCO Food Bank
27th Avenue & Van Buren

Millers Boys Club
2242 W. Missouri

Murphy I
2625 W. Buckeye

National Conference of
Christians & Jews
112 N. Central

National Guard Armory
5636 E. McDowell

North Phoenix High School
1101 E. Thomas

Ocotillo Library
102 W. Southern

O.K. Community
800 N. 7th Street

Palo Verde Library
Parkway & Campbell

Parry Rehabilitation Center
3146 E. Windsor

Pathway Central
1413 E. McDowell

Phoenix Day Care Nursery
115 E. Tonto

Phoenix Indian Medical
4212 N. 16th Street

Phoenix Union High School
512 E. Van Buren

Public Building Administration
1741 W. Jefferson

Rio Vista Center
4221 S. 4th Street

St. Luke's Hospital
525 N. 18th Street

St. Mary's Food Bank
524 S. 1st Avenue

St. Pius Day Care Center
812 South 6th Avenue

Salvation Army Family & Youth Center
1351 E. Broadway

South Mountain High School
5401 S. 7th Street

South Mountain YWCA
6355 S. 24th Street

South Phoenix Mental Health
305 W. Pima

CETA Work Sites

Southminster (Comm. Service)
1923 E. Broadway

Southwest Free Clinic
3851 W. Wier

State Department of Transportation
1801 W. Jefferson

Trevor Browne High School
7402 W. Catalina

U.S. Army Recruiting Station
321 North Central

U.S. Probation/Parole
230 N. 1st Avenue

University Park
10th Avenue & Van Buren

Urban League
1402 S. 7th Avenue

Valley Christian Center
1326 W. Hadley

V.A. Hospital
7th Street & Indian School

Wesdale Nursery
3526 W. Polk

Wesley Community Center
1300 S. 10th Street

West High School
2910 N. 19th Avenue

Y.M.C.A.
2602 E. Clarendon

Y.M.C.A.
350 N. 1st Avenue

Y.M.C.A.
449 E. Southern

Y.W.C.A
3rd Street & Earll

Yucca Library
5648 N. 15th Avenue

APPENDIX B

Selected CETA Participant Comments

(For ease of reading, redundant comments have been eliminated. The first statements under each question are representative of the most frequent comments. Comments are reproduced exactly as written.)

APPENDIX B

COMMENTS

CETA PARTICIPANTS

Question #35: I THINK THE GOOD THINGS ABOUT THE CETA PROGRAM ARE:

- The money.
- Job training.
- That I'm getting experience and education at the same time.
- The experience and opportunities.
- That they let you pick the kind of job you like and a place you want to work at.
- Getting to know people. Knowing you can work with others successfully.
- They help you find a job.
- Gives jobs to young people who are in need of a job.
- You are sure that you have some skills that you can use in the future.
- It gives you a chance to experience working.
- They help people out.
- The opportunity to work.
- The job.
- It keeps you from getting into trouble.
- That people sort of go out of their way to help you with your problems.
- The hours.
- Locations.
- The friendly Youth Advisor.
- I have more confidence in myself.
- It teaches more responsibility.
- It gives me a chance to learn new skills.
- Placing people in jobs they enjoy.
- The management.
- Good work.
- I don't have to wait too long to get a job, when I put an application in CETA.
- The way the CETA operates.
- They are good to you and they go over things well enough that I can understand them.
- It is a good program for kids.
- The job is easy and you don't have to work so many hours.
- Mostly everything.
- You get a lot of help when needed.

COMMENTS

CETA PARTICIPANTS

Question #35 (cont.): I THINK THE GOOD THINGS ABOUT THE CETA PROGRAM ARE:

- Good that we can work, pays enough. You don't get fired that easy. You can make up the hours.
- Knowing and understanding the facts you don't know.
- I think the CETA program is good cause it helps support my baby.
- The job outlet.
- They keep a person informed and check on me regularly.
- It provides a good work experience, good atmosphere to work at, and also helps us to decide our future plans.
- Alright.
- The people that are there to help you.
- Career.
- Very nice.
- That it helps me a lot in school and a lot more things that I need for school.
- The program is very helpful to me. Times are hard now and money and jobs don't come easy.
- It's a good program and benefits the people with low income like me.
- It's at high school and I don't have to go anywhere to get to my job, and my supervisor can help me.
- You don't get ripped off.
- It's a good opportunity to learn about a lot of things that can help you out through the years.
- It teaches you most things you may not already know.
- The experience and the capability I get from the program.
- It helps you a lot with the job.
- Good.
- Everything.
- They help you get more interest in the job you may want to take.
- That we work 10 hours a week and they can place us anywhere.
- That you work and get paid while training.
- That it helps me stay in school.
- It's alright being able to work at another place after losing a job.
- Increases employability, keeps kids busy.
- Learn new things, work with my hands, pay.
- The work sites CETA has are excellent. I have worked with CETA for three summers and all of them have been excellent.

COMMENTS

CETA PARTICIPANTS

Question #35 (cont.): I THINK THE GOOD THINGS ABOUT THE CETA PROGRAM ARE:

- They help students become more responsible in getting a job, they also let them become more aware in the future.
- You get a good view of what you want to be.
- They give you a chance to try different field of careers.
- The working hours and days, nice people.
- That it helps the students get up in the world and it helps give them good help.
- I like working after school.
- It's not too many hours and it's a good job.
- They're O.K.
- I learn things and it gives me reference.
- That it gives me something to do and it gives me money for things I need.
- That we can't work too many hours because you have homework.
- They let you work after school.
- It's very helpful to any students in the program. The youth advisor does her job extremely well.
- CETA has helped me mature, it has also made me more responsible. It has helped me in helping myself and others.
- If you are willing you can and you will do good and very helpful.
- I am getting the money that I need and am doing something that I enjoy.

COMMENTS

CETA PARTICIPANTS

Question #36: I THINK THE BAD THINGS ABOUT THE CETA PROGRAM ARE:

- CETA should allow students to work more than 10 hours a week.
- Pay is low.
- Pay check comes late.
- They should pay every week, not every two weeks.
- To me there are no bad things.
- They need to put more money in the program.
- If you don't have your time sheets in time you don't get paid for the weeks you've worked.
- The fact there is little room for promotion makes kids want to look elsewhere for work.
- Some of the work is cruddy.
- Checks should be brought to the work shop. Should have sick leave and vacation leave.
- Trying to get along with someone who doesn't like me.
- That after you turn 22 you're too old for the program and I feel that it's a good program.
- That sometimes they're not organized.
- They file up checks sometimes, like I worked six weeks before I got paid.
- Too many forms to fill out.
- It was cut short of funds this year, laying off many ambitious people who wanted a work experience for the future.
- Getting there on time.
- Some students are deferred because of family income.
- You really don't get enough out of it.
- Hate going to work when other things come up.
- Should have left the program like last years, work everyday Monday-Friday 2½ hours a day.
- The people who try to take advantage of CETA in don't really need the money or work anyway.
- They have to take taxes out (I know you have to), also, that you can't expect freshmen to get more hours to work to make more money.
- That I no longer have a job now that I have been paid.
- You work so many hours
- Nothing, except this questionnaire is worded all wrong, some questions are not clearly explained.

APPENDIX C

Selected CETA Parent Comments

(For ease of reading, redundant comments have been eliminated. The first statements under each question are representative of the most frequent comments. Comments are reproduced exactly as written.)

APPENDIX C

CETA PARENT SURVEY

COMMENTS:

- I really do think that more students should get very interested in CETA, because it really does help children and teenagers keep out of trouble. It gives them something to think about. And get very interested in.
- I hope they continue to have CETA job openings in the future.
- I wish the kids could work more hours.
- It is really excellent.
- Just keep up the good work.
- My comment is that I'm very happy that he is getting this training, because he is progressing very well for the future.
- I am happy that my children have been able to take part in this program.
- I think the CETA job has helped my child.
- Other than essential training and work habits the salary has provided _____ with the extra material things needed for school.
- I think the CETA Program is very good for the students. It is a challenge and an experience for them.
- Thanks for all you have done for my daughter in the past years.
- The wage guideline of the parents should be raised because of other children who may want to work and can't because parents income is supposedly too high for CETA but not enough to really live on, just can survive. CETA programs are seemingly good because it does give teenagers that qualify a chance to know what work is and hopefully the value of a dollar and maybe they will learn that money is hard to come by.
- I think the CETA program is very good for all kids who like to work. It keeps kids from stealing from others. It helps them to learn how to make a living for themself as they grow older.
- I think this program is very helpful to many students in finding better jobs.
- Payroll should be done on time.
- Don't really get enough out of it.
- It helps give her something to do - she is usually very shy and withdrawn and needs this program.
- You are doing a good job for kids that have a hard time to get a job. I want to thank you again.
- I do not think the people involved with CETA have talked to students about their interests or what they are qualified for. Why isn't there more jobs open for special education students besides baby sitting and working in the school cafeteria.
- My child is happy to be with the CETA work program. It has been a great benefit to her.

CETA PARENT SURVEY - COMMENTS - continued

- A good way for students to learn responsibilities.
- My comment on this is that I wish every student that is interested in working would get a chance.
- I think that the CETA program has given my child a working attitude that makes her want to have a job.
- It's nice to have a program like CETA. It does help.
- I agree that my son has been very good and has learned his skills at his job. And hope he continues working during summer for his Junior and Senior years of high school.
- I think the CETA program is very good.
- CETA helps me get along better with life and he likes the people he works for.
- The CETA job has helped my son a great deal as to how to manage his own learning and budget without my help, responsibility and concern for others. Thank you, CETA.
- My son enjoys his job and his youth advisor.
- My son really enjoys his job, and has really been getting some good experience. Thank you.
- I am truly happy and you are blessed to have a CETA program and some wonderful people working for the program showing such a great interest in the youth of today. I hope and pray that the CETA program will be in the future for the young people, it is needed. Thank you.
- Thank you.
- I hope my son will be qualified for the CETA program next year.
- I would like for the program to include kids that graduate from the eighth grade not just 14 years.
- We would like it very much that after completing high school that she be placed permanently doing work with autistic children - she loves that work.
- This program has helped my children earn money and get work experience.
- I wish to thank the CETA program for helping my daughter get her job and for all the people at the _____, I thank you very much for being so nice to my daughter. God bless all of you.

APPENDIX D

Selected CETA Job Supervisor Comments

(For ease of reading, redundant comments have been eliminated. The first statements under each question are representative of the most frequent comments. Comments are reproduced exactly as written.)

APPENDIX D

COMMENTS

CETA JOB SUPERVISORS

Question #29: THE STRENGTHS OF THE CETA PROGRAM AS I SEE IT ARE:

- Job and/or career development training for youngsters who would otherwise lack this experience.
- Students have an opportunity to get good working habits and earn money which gives them a constructive outlet for their energies.
- Gives students something constructive to do and at the same time learn about the job market.
- Successful in finding jobs for students.
- It makes it possible for us to have employees that we would otherwise not be able to have because we couldn't afford to pay them.
- It gives persons that wish to earn and learn a chance to do so.
- Gives the student a good overall, on-the-job experience in dealing with responsibilities of job and inter-action with co-workers as well as supervisors.
- Gives students an opportunity to work when otherwise they may not be old enough.
- Giving students work experience in a field they are interested in.
- The variety of jobs available to the students.
- There is an opportunity for youth to work in a real job situation. Here they can grasp the seriousness and importance of their education.
- Provide us with excellent students. We specify our need and the advisor provided our specific need.
- Those Youth Advisors that screen the students and send them on interviews and see them at school.
- The supervisors involvement in the program is terrific! _____ really backs these kids, and me also. If they have a problem they know they can depend on him.
- The program is only as strong as the Youth Advisors. The program is currently stronger than in the past.
- In my experience the quality of students.
- In this program my CETA student has adapted perfectly to the work situation.
- Worthwhile.
- Able to work four days per week.
- Central Adult CETA employees whose personal performance make up for inadequacies in the system.
- They provide students with jobs to earn money which many need badly. Also the program provides the students with a sense of responsibility. I'm very well pleased with the CETA program this year. I'm thankful for the program.
- Supervision.

COMMENTS

CETA JOB SUPERVISORS

Question #29 (cont.): THE STRENGTHS OF THE CETA PROGRAM AS I SEE IT ARE:

- The program provides the student with training and employment year round; rather than summer employment only. Secondly, the program promotes responsibility in the student to report to work on time, perform the necessary requirements in order to keep her/his job, and function as a responsible person tending to the needs of others, rather than themselves.
- The program helps the library to complete special projects and aids normal work flow when there are staff shortages. It gives the students the opportunity to develop desirable work habits.
- The program makes the student start thinking about career selection in time to prepare in school.
- Some students work very hard and earn the money - others do not.
- Trains students in areas otherwise unavailable to them. Makes the transition from school to work less traumatic.
- She is willing to work and do as you ask.
- To let the student know whether she wants to be a teacher or not.
- Good exposure for students--with strong back up support system.
- It helps the students set a goal for themself and also gives them responsibilities.
- I don't believe it would be right for me to rate the program one way or another. I have just struck out from the program.

COMMENTS

CETA JOB SUPERVISORS

Question #30: THE WEAKNESSES OF THE CETA PROGRAM AS I SEE IT ARE:

- Too many restrictions on hours or days they can work.
- There should be more positions available.
- There may be times that the choice of students is limited.
- Youth Advisors may have overloaded caseloads which prevents on-the-job visitations and/or consultations with students and supervisors.
- Students are not monitored closely enough and those students who do not want to work are not taken off the program so that those who do wish to learn can do so. Too many organizations are surrogate babysitters for these youth.
- Should give job site supervisors more detailed information about the program.
- Pre-orientation of job requirements and expectations of employers.
- Not enough students are interested.
- Students are not screened thoroughly enough. Too easy for them to be placed and some perhaps do not qualify.
- The participant/youth advisor ratio is too high.
- Not enough follow up--students are working and not going to school.
- The constant change of forms and paperwork.
- The CETA workers I have been involved with no longer have their jobs once the CETA program stops paying their wages.
- Some of the students involved with the program are very irresponsible. Not mine, The girl that is presently working with me is super. She is very eager. I feel that CETA should make more of an effort to place these types of individuals, rather than wasting the employers time with the before mentioned type.
- Seems to be a general lack of accounting by CETA as to the specific skills being learned by the students.
- Student age precludes real understanding of job possibilities. Too much work in only one small area for time to permit full exploration of possibilities.
- Could possibly place more students.
- Not enough 14-15 year old slots at Trevor Browne High School.
- I do not believe payroll should be picked up before Friday as we do not know if the student will show on Thursday.
- The program itself is all right. The problem from my point of view is that high school kids seem to be pretty immature generally.
- Advisors do not have knowledge of work site.
- I have had much success with CETA people.
- More focus on training for specific job area.
- They need to find jobs the students are interested in instead of just placing them because they live in the area.

COMMENTS

CETA JOB SUPERVISORS

Question #30 (cont.): THE WEAKNESSES OF THE CETA PROGRAM AS I SEE IT ARE:

- The students do not get reasonable explanations of the "paperwork"--if they are told it does not seem to get through to them.
- Some students don't take advantage of the opportunity given them and feel the accuracy essential in library work is unimportant.
- Disorganized.
- Payroll system, I must say that it has improved lately.
- Not working closely enough with the schools so that the schools are reinforcing the work time.
- Not enough qualified typists.
- If we have too many students it becomes difficult to coordinate jobs for them.
- Fringe benefits start immediately--not after a probation period.
- Difficult for them to get their time in while a librarian is present, (librarian leaves at 3:30), for good supervision of their work.
- The program should operate all year instead of just 9 months.
- Sometimes I find it hard to reach a worker--it seems there is a large turnover rate in Youth Advisors.
- Is not taking their supervisor serious (not understanding that they are their boss).
- Students are lax in their responsibilities. They treat the whole thing like a game.
- Students poorly prepared for employment or training.
- I was not asked to participate in this program, only told!
- Not having enough time cards.
- Most of the students we have do not seem to want to work, they seem to want to play most of the time, we need those who really want to work instead of playing around.

APPENDIX E

Selected CETA Youth Advisor Comments

(For ease of reading, redundant comments have been eliminated. The first statements under each question are representative of the most frequent comments. Comments are reproduced exactly as written.)

APPENDIX E

COMMENTS

CETA YOUTH ADVISORS

Question #29: THE STRENGTHS OF THE CETA PROGRAM ARE:

- Gives students the opportunity to acquire better work habits. Increases skill level, helps them prepare for jobs after school. Gives them experience in the field they are interested in.
- The experiences given to the students and the financial help they get.
- Provides jobs for economic disadvantaged. Helps some kids stay in school. Provides learning skills to prepare them for the job market.
- The personal contact - the rapport established, the counseling with the students.
- In the youth division: screening and placing of students by job interest, which in turn keeps students working and learning good work habits.

Question #30: THE WEAKNESSES OF THE CETA PROGRAM ARE:

- Paperwork - time consumed by paperwork takes away from counseling and contact.
- The payroll system - the ethnic percentages.
- Payroll; takes too long to pay students, too much paperwork, constant change in paperwork, feel that time would be better spent working with schools and students.
- Youth Advisors have no place to go as far as promotion - you tend to stagnate.
- Not enough hours for students (biggest complaint).

Question #31: HOW WOULD YOU CHANGE THE PROGRAM IF YOU HAD THE OPPORTUNITY?

- Cut the paperwork - intake needy kids regardless of ethnic background.
- I would have a smaller case load and develop quality, and make sure the placement was excellent and only give a job to a student who <u>really</u> wants to learn and get experience. I would station a Youth Advisor at a school full time and cut out the fifty meetings per week.
- I think that some of the changes that have already been made such as smaller case loads have helped the program a lot.
- I would like to see the bank handle the payroll so if a check had to be sent back for adjustment it could be corrected in 20 minutes not 2 weeks.
- I think it's great. But if you have the money to hire someone you should; and not be concerned about your case load being too large.
- Have assigned intake.

APPENDIX F

Performance Standards and Goals (Title IIB and Title IV)

Title IIB

PHOENIX UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
CETA DIVISION

CITY OF PHOENIX

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND GOALS

CONTRACT YEAR BEGINNING OCTOBER 1, 1979 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 1980

I. Performance Standards

A. Participation Rate. 100%

No less than one hundred percent of all contracted enrollments and placements will be accomplished during the contract period.

B. Terminations

1. Positive Terminations 70%

No less than 70 percent of ALL TERMINATIONS will be positive terminations. Positive terminations are classified either as placements or as other positive terminations.

a. Placement Rate 10%

No less than 10 percent of ALL TERMINATED participants will be placed in unsubsidized employment in at least the minimum Federal hourly wage.

b. Other Positive Termination Rate 60%

Up to 60 percent of ALL TERMINATIONS may be classified as other positive terminations:

These include:

(1) entered or remained in full-time academic or vocational school

(2) entered an employment/training program not funded under CETA, or a CETA-funded program not operated by this Prime Sponsor.

(3) completion of program objectives not involving entrance into unsubsidized employment.

2. Negative Terminations . . . . . .

The program is to strive for a 100 percent positive termination rate. However, up to 30 percent of ALL TERMINATIONS may be classified as negative terminations.

These include:

a. Health/Pregnancy

b. Family care

c. Transportation problems

d. Refused to continue

e. Administrative separation

f. Cannot locate

g. Moved from area

h. Exceeded maximum wage or allowance limits

i. Found ineligible after enrollment

C. Retention Rate . . . . . .at 30/60/90 days

Follow-up is to be conducted on all placements. After 30 days, not less than 85 percent of these placements are to be employed in the original job or have been upgraded to a better position; after 60 days not less than 80 percent; and after 90 days, not less than 75 percent.

II. Enrollment Goals

The program should strive, through selective outreach and other means to enroll and place the following percentages of significant segments of the targeted population:

A. City of Phoenix enrollment and placement 100%

100 percent of all participants and placements will reside in the City of Phoenix.

B. Enrollment and placement of significant segments of the population.

1. Economically Disadvantaged 100%

No less than 100 percent of all participants and placements should be economically disadvantaged upon enrollment.

2. Distribution of Service by Sex . . . . . Female 52%

No less than 52 percent of all participants and placements should be female.

3. Distribution of Service by Age . . . . . .

No less than 100 percent of all participants and placements should be 19 years of age or younger upon enrollment.

4. Ethnic Breakout

The following enrollment and placement percentages shall be striven for:

White 16%

Black 50%

Indian 8%

Other 1%

Hispanic 25%

III. Program Evaluation

The program will be evaluated during the contract period. Evaluation criteria will be based upon but not limited to those set forth in the Performance Standards and Goals.

Title IV

CITY OF PHOENIX
Human Resources Department
CETA Division
In-School LEA
Youth Employment & Training Program

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND GOALS

I. Performance Standards

A. Participation Rate. 100%
No less than one hundred percent of all authorized enrollments will be filled during the funding period.

B. Terminations

1. Positive Terminations. . . . . 75 - 100%
No less than 75 percent of ALL TERMINATIONS will be positive terminations. Positive terminations are classified either as placements or as other positive terminations.

a. Placement Rate . . . . . 15 - 100%
Not less than 15 percent of ALL TERMINATED enrollees will be placed in unsubsidized employment at no less than the Federal Minimum Hourly Wage.

b. Other Positive Termination Rate. . . . . 0 - 85%
Up to 85% of ALL TERMINATIONS may be classified as other positive terminations. These include:

(1) Enrolled full-time in an academic or vocational school.
(2) Entered another manpower program.
(3) Entered the military.
(4) Successfully completed program.

2. Negative Terminations. . . . . 0 - 25%
The program is to strive for a 100 percent positive termination rate. However, up to 25 percent of ALL TERMINATIONS may be classified as negative terminations. These include:

a. Health/Pregnancy
b. Family Care

c. Transportation Problems

d. Refused to Continue

e. Administrative Separation

f. Cannot Locate

g. Moved from Area

3. Retention Rate. . . . . at 30/60/90 days 80/70/65%
Follow-up is to be conducted on all persons who have been placed in unsubsidized employment. After 30 days, not less than 80 percent of these persons are to be employed in the original job or have been upgraded to a better position; after 60 days, not less than 70 percent; and, after 90 days, not less than 65 percent.

II. Enrollment Goals

The program should strive, through selective outreach and other means to enroll the following minimal percentages of significant segments and target groups:

A. City Enrollment Breakdown. 100%
100 percent of all people enrolled or placed should reside in the City of Phoenix.

B. Enrollment of Significant Segments and Target Groups.

1. Economically Disadvantaged. 80%
No less than 80 percent of all enrollees shall be economically disadvantaged.

2. Family Income -
A maximum of 20 percent of the total participant intake may exceed 70% of the Lower Living Standard Income Level (LLSIL); however, no participant shall exceed 85% of the LLSIL. 20%

3. Welfare Recipients. 12%

4. Distribution of Service by Sex

(a) Female. 55%

(b) Male. 45%

5. Juvenile Offender. 5%

6. Handicapped. 5%

7. Individuals Lacking Credentials. 100%

8. Dropouts 10%

9. Ethnic Groups

White (not including Hispanic)	27.6%
Black	35.2%
Hispanic	31.2%
American Indian	5%
Other (Asian and Pacific Islanders)	1%

10. Age

16 - 19 year olds	95%
20 - 21 year olds	5%

III. Program Evaluation and Assessment

The program will be monitored and assessed to determine effectiveness during the period of the contract. Assessment criteria will be based upon (but not limited to) those set forth in the Performance Standards and Goals. (See I., above).

Any additional information requested by City of Phoenix staff, members of the Manpower Advisory Council, or the City Council, may be used in determining the merits of continued funding for the program.

CF:td